1131. c 14
3

THE TRIAL AND LIFE OF THE Rev. Dr. DODD,

Who was Tried, Cast, and Condemned, at the *Old Bailey*, on *Saturday Feb.* 22, 1777, for Forgery.

42-6-27-71

Printed in the Year 1777.

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE TRIAL, &c.

ON Saturday Februa 22, 1777, came on the Trial of Dr. Dodd, on a charge of Forgery, at the Sessions House, in the Old Bailey, which was prefaced by the arguments of the following counsel, Messrs, Buller, Cowper, and Howarth, for M. Dodd against the trial, and by Mr. Mansfield and Mr. Davenport, counsel for the prosecution in support of it. The arguments were occasioned by Mr. Lewis Robinson having been taken from the gaol of Newgate to Hicks's Hall to give Evidence against Dr. Dodd, without the order of court, and Lewis Robinson being himself committed as principal.

Mr. Howarth as opening counsel, contended that the prisoner ought not to be put on his trial, as the principal, and, in fact the only evidence

evidence againſt him had been ſurreptiouſly obtained; that Lewis Robinſon was committed for the fact, and that the evidence againſt Dr. Dodd, as appeared upon the back of the indictment, wat neither proper nor legal; that grand juries were only judges of FACT not of LAW.

Mr. Cowper on the ſame ſide urged, that the indictent ought to be quaſhed, as the grand jury had given it the ſanction of an evidence, but neither in law nor juſtice ought to have been produced; that Lewis Robinſon was particips criminis, and cited the caſe of Mrs. Rudd and the Perreaus, when the judges themſelves differed in opinion about the nature of admiſſion of evidence, who was not even in the cuſtody of that court.

Mr. Buller alſo contended that Dr. Dodd ought not to be tried on that bill of indictment. One diſſenting voice of the grand jury, he ſaid, was ſufficient to quaſh the indictment. This indictment ſtood on the ſame ground of renſoning. The evidence ſhould be ſuch as law allows. He ſaid the parties concerned in the procecution had bargained with the evidence for the life of Dr. Dodd, that his evidence had an improper effect before the grand jury; that he is a perſon whoſe evidence ought not to be credited, and that Lord Hale, p. 303, had a caſe exactly in point in favour of the priſoner. Two men were committed for the FACT, one

CONFESSED

CONFESSED and was admitted evidence on the ground of CONFESSION, which he could not have been without, and therefore Robinſon, not having confeſſed, he hoped the indictment would be quaſhed.

Dr. Dodd, alſo, read a paper, previous to the arguments, ſtating, that he thought he ought not to plead to ſuch an indictment, the evidence having been ſurreptitiouſly obtained, and deſired the judges to be heard by council, in oppoſition to his being put on his trial.

The names of the jury,

Samuel Elliott,	*Thomas Langſtaff,*
William Berry,	*John Cochrau,*
Thomas Tomlin,	*Pitiaway,*
John Ruſſel,	*John Quick,*
Francis Anſon,	*Edward Davis,*
George Lyde,	*Thomas Clark.*

The indictment conſiſted of eight counts;

1ſt. Forging a bond with intent to defraud lord Cheſterfield.

2d. Forging the ſame with intent to defraud Mr. Fletcr.

3d. Publiſhing the bond but forged with intent to defraud lord Cheſteerfield.

4th. Publiſhing it with intent to defraud Mr. Fletcher.

The

The 5th count count charged the Dr. with forging a certain receipt affixed to the ſaid bond, purporting to be the receipt of the earl of Cheſterfield, with intent to defraud the ſaid Earl.

6th. Forging the receipt with intent to defraud Mr. Fletcher.

7th. Publiſhing the ſaid receipt, ſo forged, with intent to defraud lord Cheſterfield.

And 8th. Publiſhing it with intent to de-

Query to Lord Cheſterfield. Do you know William Dodd?

A. Yes.

Q. He was your tutor?

A. Yes, I have ofteen ſeen him write—I believe the name of Dodd ſubſcribed as witneſs, is the hand writing of Dr. Dodd, but I could not form an opinion by whgm the name of Cheſterfield was written.

Mr. Howarth to Manley. Did you deliver the bond to Mr. Fletcher, or leave it?

A. I gave it to Mr. Fletcher.

Mr. Albertinus ſwore, that neither of the names were written by lord Cheſterfield.

Mr. Samuel Leacroft was ſworn.

Q. Did you ever ſee Dr. Dodd write?

A. connot ſay I ever have.

Mr. Neild, I am inclined to believe the name of Dodd in this bond, to be the handwriting of Dr. Dodd, and the reaſon I believe it to be his is I am treaſurer to the ſociety for

the

the relief of perſons impriſoned for ſmall debts. Dr. Dodd was the founder of that ſociety, and I have often ſeen him write.

Mr. Oakes, (ſteward to lord Cheſterfield) I do not believe either the bond, or receipt, to be of lord Cheſterfield's ſigning.

As ſoon as the counſel had briefly ſtated the nature of the charge againſt the priſoner, Mr. Mansfield with great delicacy entered into a larger explanation of his client's caſe; he began with declaring, that the gentlemen at whoſe inſtance the proſecution was carried on, by no means wiſhed to urge any matter that might look like malice, or bear the ſlighteſt appearance of revenge.

Lord Cheſterfield being ſworn, was aſked to produce the releaſe given by him to Mr. Fletcher. He delivered the inſtrument to the Clerk of the Court, who read it aloud, and it appeared to be a legal diſcharge executed by Mr. Flecher, who thereby acquitted Lord Cheſterfield, for the valuable conſideration of five ſhillings lawful money of great Britain, of all claims from the beginning of the world to the preſent day.

The Second Part will be publiſhed in a few days.

BRITISH MUSEUM